arXiv:1407.3819v3 [math.CA] 29 Jul 2015

WELL-LOCALIZED OPERATORS ON MATRIX WEIGHTED L^2 SPACES

KELLY BICKEL† AND BRETT D. WICK‡

Abstract. Nazarov-Treil-Volberg recently proved an elegant two-weight T1 theorem for "almost diagonal" operators that played a key role in the proof of the A_2 conjecture for dyadic shifts and related operators. In this paper, we obtain a generalization of their T1 theorem to the setting of matrix weights. Our theorem does differ slightly from the scalar results, a fact attributable almost completely to differences between the scalar and matrix Carleson Embedding Theorems. The main tools include a reduction to the study of well-localized operators, a new system of Haar functions adapted to matrix weights, and a matrix Carleson Embedding Theorem.

1. Introduction

In this paper, the dimension d is fixed and L^2 will denote $L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^d)$, namely the set of vector-valued functions satisfying

$$\|f\|_{L^2}^2 \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|f(x)\|_{\mathbb{C}^d}^2 \, dx < \infty.$$

We will be primarily interested in *matrix weights*, $d \times d$ positive definite matrix-valued functions with locally integrable entries. Given such a weight W, let $L^2(W)$ be the set of functions satisfying

$$\|f\|_{L^2(W)}^2 \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left\| W^{\frac{1}{2}}(x) f(x) \right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d}^2 \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \langle W(x) f(x), f(x) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \, dx < \infty.$$

Given matrix weights V and W, a natural question is: when does a bounded operator T mapping L^2 to itself extend to a bounded operator mapping $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$ and what is the norm of T as a map from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$?

If we consider the special one-dimensional case when $V = W = w$, this question has a classical answer. Indeed, a Calderón-Zygmund operator T extends to a bounded operator on $L^2(w)$ if and only if w is an A_2 Muckenhoupt weight, namely:

$$[w]_{A_2} \equiv \sup_I \langle w \rangle_I \langle w^{-1} \rangle_I < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all intervals I and $\langle w \rangle_I \equiv \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I w(x) dx$. In contrast, the question of the operator norm of T on $L^2(w)$, and its sharp dependence on $[w]_{A_2}$, called the A_2 conjecture, remained open for decades. Lacey-Petermichl-Reguera made substantial progress on this question in [8] by establishing the sharp bound for dyadic shifts and as a corollary, obtained new proofs of the bound for simple Calderón-Zygmund operators including the Hilbert transform, Riesz transforms, and Beurling transform. Their proof rested on an

Date: July 30, 2015.

† Research supported in part by National Science Foundation DMS grants # 0955432 and #1448846.

‡ Research supported in part by National Science Foundation DMS grant # 0955432, by the Simons Foundation and by the Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut Oberwolfach.

elegant two-weight T1 theorem due to Nazarov-Treil-Volberg [11] coupled with technical testing estimates.

Using a refined method of decomposing Calderón-Zygmund operators as sums of dyadic shifts and an improvement of the Lacey-Petermichl-Reguera estimates, Hytönen resolved the A_2 conjecture in 2012 in [4] and showed

$$\|T\|_{L^2(w)\to L^2(w)} \lesssim [w]_{A_2}$$

for all Calderón-Zygmund operators T.

We are interested the analogue of the A_2 conjecture in the setting of matrix weights. However, due to complications arising in the matrix case, the current literature is less developed. Still, the boundedness of Calderón-Zygmund operators is known. In 1997, Treil-Volberg showed in [14] that the Hilbert transform H extends to a bounded operator on $L^2(W)$ if and only if W is an A_2 matrix weight, i.e. if and only if

$$\left[W\right]_{A_2} \equiv \sup_I \left\| \langle W\rangle_I^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle W^{-1}\rangle_I^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|^2 < \infty,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the norm of the matrix acting on $\mathbb{C}^d$. Soon after, Nazarov-Treil [12] extended this result to general (classical) Calderón-Zygmund operators and in the interim, the study of operators on matrix-weighted spaces has received a great deal of attention. See [2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 15]. However, the question of the sharp dependence on $[W]_{A_2}$ is still open and this seems to be a very difficult problem. In [1], the two authors with S. Petermichl showed that

$$\|H\|_{L^2(W)\to L^2(W)} \lesssim [W]_{A_2}^{\frac{3}{2}} \log [W]_{A_2},$$

for all A_2 weights W, but this bound is unlikely to be sharp.

Rather, a proof yielding a sharp estimate would likely follow, as in the scalar case, from the combination of (1) a sharp T1 theorem and (2) appropriate testing estimates. The goal of this paper is to establish the T1 theorem and specifically, obtain matrix generalizations of the two-weight T1 theorems of Nazarov-Treil-Volberg from [11] about "almost diagonal" operators including Haar multipliers and dyadic shifts. These generalizations are interesting in their own right because they give two-weight results for all pairs of matrix A_2 weights, which is a new development. It seems possible that, as in the scalar case, these T1 theorems will prove a robust tool for studying the dependence of operator norms on the A_2 characteristic. Before discussing the main results in more detail, we require several definitions.

1.1. **The Main Results.** Throughout the paper, $\mathcal{D}$ denotes the standard dyadic grid on $\mathbb{R}$ and $A \lesssim B$ means $A \leq C(d)B$, where $C(d)$ is a (absolute) dimensional constant. For $I \in \mathcal{D}$, let h_I be the standard Haar function defined by

$$h_I \equiv |I|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbf{1}_{I_+} - \mathbf{1}_{I_-}\right),$$

where I_+ is the right half of I and I_- is the left half of I. To the dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}$, associate the unique binary tree where each I is connected to its two children I_- and I_+. Given that dyadic tree, let $d_{\text{tree}}(I,J)$ denote the "tree distance" between I and J, namely, the number of edges on the shortest path connecting I and J. The "almost diagonal" operators of interest possess a band structure defined as follows:

Definition 1.1. A bounded operator T on L^2 is a called a *band operator with radius* r if T satisfies

$$\langle T h_I e, h_J v\rangle_{L^2} = 0$$

for all intervals $I, J \in \mathcal{D}$ with $d_{\text{tree}}(I, J) > r$ and vectors $e, v \in \mathbb{C}^d$.

Given a matrix weight W and interval I in $\mathcal{D}$, define the matrices:

$$W(I) \equiv \int_I W(x)\, dx \quad \text{and} \quad \langle W \rangle_I \equiv \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I W(x)\, dx = \frac{W(I)}{|I|}.$$

In this paper, we will only consider weights W with the property of being an A_2 weight, and without loss of generality, we can focus on the question of when a band operator T extends to a bounded operator from $L^2(W^{-1})$ to $L^2(V)$ with norm C for matrix weights V, W. It is not hard to show that this occurs precisely when

$$\left\| M_{V^{\frac{1}{2}}} T M_{W^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} = C.$$

The main results of this paper are then the following theorems.

Theorem 1.2. *Let W, V be matrix A_2 weights and let T be a band operator with radius r. Then $M_{V^{\frac{1}{2}}} T M_{W^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ extends to a bounded operator on L^2 if and only if*

$$\|TW\mathbf{1}_I e\|_{L^2(V)} \leq A_1 \langle W(I)e, e\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{1}$$

$$\|T^* V \mathbf{1}_I e\|_{L^2(W)} \leq A_2 \langle V(I)e, e\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{2}$$

for all intervals $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and vectors $e \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Furthermore,

$$\left\| M_{V^{\frac{1}{2}}} T M_{W^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \leq 2^{2r} C(d) \left(A_1 B(W) + A_2 B(V) \right),$$

where $C(d)$ is a dimensional constant and $B(W)$ and $B(V)$ are constants depending on W and V from an application of the matrix Carleson Embedding Theorem.

The definitions of the constants $B(W)$ and $B(V)$ are given in Theorem 3.4, the matrix Carleson Embedding Theorem used in this paper, and discussed further in Remark 3.5. As in [11], the conditions of Theorem 1.2 can be relaxed slightly to yield the following result:

Theorem 1.3. *Let W, V be matrix A_2 weights and let T be a band operator with radius r. Then $M_{V^{\frac{1}{2}}} T M_{W^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ extends to a bounded operator on L^2 if and only if the following two conditions hold:*

(i) For all intervals $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and vectors $e \in \mathbb{C}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{1}_I T W \mathbf{1}_I e\|_{L^2(V)} &\leq A_1 \langle W(I)e, e\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \|\mathbf{1}_I T^* V \mathbf{1}_I e\|_{L^2(W)} &\leq A_2 \langle V(I)e, e\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) For all intervals $I, J \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfying $2^{-r}|I| \leq |J| \leq 2^r |I|$ and vectors $e, \nu \in \mathbb{C}^d$,

$$\left| \langle T_W \mathbf{1}_I e, \mathbf{1}_J \nu \rangle_{L^2(V)} \right| \leq A_3 \langle W(I)e, e\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle V(J)\nu, \nu\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\left\| M_{V^{\frac{1}{2}}} T M_{W^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \leq 2^{2r} C(d) \left(A_1 B(W) + A_2 B(V) + A_3 \right),$$

where $C(d)$ is a dimensional constant and $B(W)$ and $B(V)$ are constants depending on W and V from an application of the matrix Carleson Embedding Theorem.

Remark 1.4. An observant reader, and expert in the area, will notice that Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 are strictly weaker than the results of Nazarov-Treil-Volberg [11] in two respects. First, our results are only proved for pairs V, W of matrix A_2 weights and second, they introduce additional constants $B(V)$ and $B(W)$ in the norm estimates, which do not come from the testing conditions.

However, it is worth pointing out that both of these shortcomings are the direct result of differences between the scalar Carleson Embedding Theorem and the current matrix Carleson Embedding Theorem. In the scalar case, the Carleson Embedding Theorem holds for *all* weights and the embedding constant is an absolute multiple of the constant obtained from the testing condition. In the matrix case, the current Carleson Embedding Theorem, Theorem 3.4, is only known for matrix A_2 weights and the embedding constant is the testing constant times an additional constant $B(W)$, depending upon the weight W.

A careful reading of our paper reveals that, if one can improve the underlying matrix Carleson Embedding Theorem in these two respects, then our arguments will give T1 theorems with sharp constants that hold for all pairs of matrix weights. It then seems likely that these results could be used as a tool to approach the matrix A_2 conjecture, at least in the setting of dyadic shifts and related operators.

Indeed, the authors recently learned that Amalia Culiuc and Sergei Treil have obtained an improved Carleson Embedding Theorem for arbitrary matrix weights in the more general non-homogeneous setting. The two authors with Culiuc and Treil are currently investigating the behavior of well-localized operators in this more general setting.

It is also worth observing that related and interesting results are obtained by R. Kerr in [6, 7]. He shows that band operators on L^2 will be bounded from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$ if the matrix weights V and W are both in the matrix analogue of A_∞ (denoted $A_{2,0}$) and satisfy a joint A_2 condition.

Remark 1.5. If the entries of W, V are not locally square-integrable, i.e. not in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$, one needs to be a little careful about interpreting the expressions on the left-hand sides of (1) and (2) and the analogous expressions in Theorem 1.3. This technicality can be handled in a way similar to that found in [11]. Indeed, observe that if W, W' are matrix weights satisfying $W' \leq W$, then

$$\left\| M_{W'^{\frac{1}{2}}} T^* M_{V^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \leq \left\| M_{W^{\frac{1}{2}}} T^* M_{V^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2}$$

and taking adjoints gives

$$\left\| M_{V^{\frac{1}{2}}} T M_{W'^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \leq \left\| M_{V^{\frac{1}{2}}} T M_{W^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2}.$$

Now, to interpret the first necessary condition appropriately, let $\{W_n\}$ be a sequence of matrix weights with entries in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ increasing to W. Then, the boundedness of $M_{V^{\frac{1}{2}}} T M_{W^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ implies that

$$\|T W_n \mathbf{1}_I e\|_{L^2(V)} \leq C < \infty$$

for some constant C uniformly in n. It is not difficult to show that this implies $\left\{ M_{V^{\frac{1}{2}}} T W_n \mathbf{1}_I e \right\}$ has a limit in L^2, which is independent of the sequence $\{W_n\}$ chosen. So, there is no ambiguity in calling this limit function $V^{\frac{1}{2}} T W \mathbf{1}_I e$ and interpreting the lefthand side of (1) as its L^2 norm. The dual expressions are interpreted analogously. We can similarly interpret the term in (ii) from Theorem 1.3 as the inner product between $V^{\frac{1}{2}} T W \mathbf{1}_I e$ and $V^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{1}_J \nu$ in L^2.

To interpret the sufficient condition, fix any sequences $\{W_n\}$ and $\{V_n\}$ in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ increasing to W and V respectively. Conditions (1) and (2) can be interpreted as the estimates

$$\|TW_n\mathbf{1}_I e\|_{L^2(V_n)} \leq A_1 \langle W_n(I)e, e\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
$$\|T^*V_n\mathbf{1}_I e\|_{L^2(W_n)} \leq A_2 \langle V_n(I)e, e\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which are uniform in n, e, and I. Then Theorem 1.2 gives the bound for $\left\|M_{V_n^{\frac{1}{2}}} T M_{W_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right\|_{L^2\to L^2}$ which implies the desired bound for $\left\|M_{V^{\frac{1}{2}}} T M_{W^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right\|_{L^2\to L^2}$. The analogous interpretations of the expressions in Theorem 1.3 should also be clear.

1.2. **Summary and Outline of the Paper.** The remainder of the paper consists of the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. To outline the proof technique, assume that W, V are matrix A_2 weights. It is not hard to show that $M_{V^{\frac{1}{2}}} T M_{W^{\frac{1}{2}}} : L^2 \to L^2$ is bounded with operator norm C if and only if the operator

$$T_W \equiv TM_W : L^2(W) \to L^2(V) \quad \text{satisfies} \quad \|T_W\|_{L^2(W)\to L^2(V)} = C.$$

Because T is a band operator, T_W will have a particularly nice structure. Following the language and proof strategy of Nazarov-Treil-Volberg [11], we will show T_W is well-localized. Section 4 contains the details of well-localized operators, their connections to band operators, and the analogues of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 for well-localized operators. We call these results Theorems 4.2 and 4.3. These theorems will immediately imply our main results: Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

In Sections 2 and 3, the paper develops the tools need to prove Theorems 4.2 and 4.3. In Section 2, we define and outline the properties of a system of Haar functions adapted to a general matrix weight W. This system appears to be new in the context of matrix weights. We also require a matrix Carleson Embedding Theorem. We use the ideas of Treil-Volberg [14] and Isralowitz-Kwon-Pott [5] to obtain such a theorem with the best known constant. Details are given in Section 3.

Section 5 contains the proofs of Theorems 4.2 and 4.3. The well-localized structure of T_W makes T_W amenable to separate analyses of its diagonal part and upper and lower triangular parts, which behave like nice paraproducts. We compute the norm by duality and as part of the argument, decompose the functions in question relative to weighted Haar bases adapted to W and V respectively. To control the upper and lower triangular pieces, we define associated paraproducts and show they are bounded using the testing hypothesis and matrix Carleson Embedding Theorem. We bound the diagonal pieces using the well-localized structure of T_W coupled with properties of the system of Haar functions and the given testing conditions.

2. Weighted Haar Basis

Let W be a matrix weight, and let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the operator norm of a matrix on $\mathbb{C}^d$. In this section, we construct a set of disbalanced Haar functions adapted to W, which we denote H_W. First, fix $J \in \mathcal{D}$ and let $v_J^1, \ldots, v_J^d$ be a set of orthonormal eigenvectors of the positive matrix:

$$\begin{aligned} W(J_-)W(J_+)^{-1}W(J_-) + W(J_-) &= W(J_-)W(J_+)^{-1}W(J_-) + W(J_+)W(J_+)^{-1}W(J_-) \\ &= W(J)W(J_+)^{-1}W(J_-). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Furthermore, for $1 \leq j \leq d$, define the constant

$$w_J^j \equiv \left\| \left(W(J)W(J_+)^{-1}W(J_-)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} v_J^j \right\|.$$

Since the matrix (3) is positive and v_J^j is a normalized eigenvector, it follows that:

$$(w_J^j)^{-1} v_J^j = \left(W(J)W(J_+)^{-1}W(J_-)\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} v_J^j \qquad \forall 1 \leq j \leq d.$$

Definition 2.1. For each $J \in \mathcal{D}$, define the *vector-valued Haar functions on J adapted to W* as follows:

$$h_J^{W,j} \equiv (w_J^j)^{-1} \left(W(J_+)^{-1}W(J_-)v_J^j \mathbf{1}_{J_+} - v_J^j \mathbf{1}_{J_-}\right) \qquad \forall 1 \leq j \leq d. \tag{4}$$

If the constant function $\mathbf{1}_{[0,\infty)}e$ is in $L^2(W)$ for any nonzero e in $\mathbb{C}^d$, let $\{e_1, \ldots, e_{p_1}\}$ be an orthonormal basis of the subspace of $\mathbb{C}^d$ satisfying $\mathbf{1}_{[0,\infty)}e \in L^2(W)$. Define

$$h_1^{W,i} \equiv c_1^i \mathbf{1}_{[0,\infty)} e_i \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, p_1,$$

where c_1^i is chosen so that $\|h_1^{W,i}\|_{L^2(W)} = 1$. Define the functions

$$h_2^{W,i} \equiv c_2^i \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty,0]} \nu_i \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, p_2,$$

where $\{\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_{p_2}\}$ is an orthonormal basis of the subspace of $\mathbb{C}^d$ satisfying $\mathbf{1}_{(-\infty,0]}\nu \in L^2(W)$, in an analogous way. Define H_W, the *system of Haar functions adapted to W*, by:

$$H_W \equiv \left\{h_J^{W,j}\right\} \cup \left\{h_k^{W,i}\right\}.$$

One should notice that if the constant functions $\mathbf{1}_{[0,\infty)}e$ and $\mathbf{1}_{(-\infty,0]}e$ are not in $L^2(V)$ for all $e \in \mathbb{C}^d$, then $H_W = \left\{h_J^{W,j}\right\}$.

We now show that H_W is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(W)$.

Lemma 2.2. *The system H_W is an orthonormal system in $L^2(W)$.*

Proof. We first prove that the system $\left\{h_J^{W,j}\right\}$ is orthogonal. Fix $h_J^{W,j}$ and $h_I^{W,i}$. First, assume $I \neq J$. Then, one interval must be strictly contained in the other because otherwise, the inner product trivially vanishes by support conditions. Without loss of generality, assume $I \subsetneq J$. This implies that $h_J^{W,j}$ equals a constant vector on I, which we will denote by e. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{W,j} \right\rangle_{L^2(W)} &= \int_I \left\langle W(x)h_I^{W,i}, e \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} dx \\
&= \int_I (w_I^i)^{-1} \left\langle W(x)\left(W(I_+)^{-1}W(I_-)v_I^i \mathbf{1}_{I_+} - v_I^i \mathbf{1}_{I_-}\right), e \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} dx \\
&= (w_I^i)^{-1} \left\langle W(I_+)W(I_+)^{-1}W(I_-)v_I^i, e \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} - (w_I^i)^{-1} \left\langle W(I_-)v_I^i, e \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

One should notice that the definition of e played no role; in fact, the above arguments show that each $h_J^{W,j}$ has mean zero with respect to W. Now assume $I = J$ and $i \neq j$. Observe

that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle h_J^{W,i}, h_J^{W,j} \right\rangle_{L^2(W)} = \int_J \left\langle W(x) h_J^{W,i}, h_J^{W,j} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} dx \\
&= (w_J^j)^{-1}(w_J^i)^{-1} \int_J \left\langle W(x) \left(W(J_+)^{-1} W(J_-) v_J^i \mathbf{1}_{J_+} - v_J^i \mathbf{1}_{J_-} \right), W(J_+)^{-1} W(J_-) v_J^j \mathbf{1}_{J_+} - v_J^j \mathbf{1}_{J_-} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} dx \\
&= (w_J^j)^{-1}(w_J^i)^{-1} \left(\left\langle W(J_+) W(J_+)^{-1} W(J_-) v_J^i, W(J_+)^{-1} W(J_-) v_J^j \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + \left\langle W(J_-) v_J^i, v_J^j \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \right) \\
&= (w_J^j)^{-1}(w_J^i)^{-1} \left\langle \left(W(J_-) W(J_+)^{-1} W(J_-) + W(J_-) \right) v_J^i, v_J^j \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

since v_J^i and v_J^j are orthonormal eigenvectors of $W(J_-)W(J_+)^{-1}W(J_-) + W(J_-)$. Since each $h_J^{W,j}$ has mean zero with respect to W and since each $h_J^{W,j}$ is either supported in $(-\infty, 0]$ or $[0, \infty)$, it is clear that

$$\left\langle h_J^{W,j}, h_k^{W,i} \right\rangle_{L^2(W)} = 0 \qquad \forall J \in \mathcal{D}$$

and for all indices i, j, k. By construction, it is also clear that $\left\{ h_k^{W,j} \right\}$ is an orthonormal set in $L^2(W)$. Finally, to see that $\left\{ h_J^{W,j} \right\}$ is normalized, fix $h_J^{W,j}$ and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle h_J^{W,j}, h_J^{W,j} \right\rangle_{L^2(W)} &= (w_J^j)^{-2} \left\langle \left(W(J_-) W(J_+)^{-1} W(J_-) + W(J_-) \right) v_J^j, v_J^j \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\
&= \left\langle \left(W(J_-) W(J_+)^{-1} W(J_-) + W(J_-) \right) \left(W(J_-) W(J_+)^{-1} W(J_-) + W(J_-) \right)^{-1} v_J^j, v_J^j \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\
&= 1,
\end{aligned}$$

using the properties of v_J^j and the definition of w_J^j. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 2.3. *The orthonormal system H_W is complete in $L^2(W)$.*

Proof. Fix f in $L^2(W)$, and assume f is orthogonal to every function in H_W. Specifically, f is orthogonal to the set $\left\{ h_J^{W,j} \right\}$. Then, for each $J \in \mathcal{D}$ and $j = 1, \ldots, d$,

$$0 = \left\langle f, h_J^{W,j} \right\rangle_{L^2(W)}.$$

Multiplying by a constant gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= |J_-|^{-1} \left\langle W(J_+)^{-1} W(J_-) v_J^j \mathbf{1}_{J_+} - v_J^j \mathbf{1}_{J_-}, f \right\rangle_{L^2(W)} \\
&= |J_-|^{-1} \int_J \left\langle W(J_+)^{-1} W(J_-) v_J^j \mathbf{1}_{J_+} - v_J^j \mathbf{1}_{J_-}, W(x) f(x) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} dx \\
&= \left\langle W(J_+)^{-1} W(J_-) v_J^j, \langle Wf \rangle_{J_+} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} - \left\langle v_J^j, \langle Wf \rangle_{J_-} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\
&= \left\langle v_J^j, W(J_-) W(J_+)^{-1} \langle Wf \rangle_{J_+} - \langle Wf \rangle_{J_-} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for each j and $v_J^1, \ldots, v_J^d$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{C}^d$, we can conclude that

$$\langle Wf \rangle_{J_-} = W(J_-) W(J_+)^{-1} \langle Wf \rangle_{J_+}. \tag{5}$$

Adding $\langle Wf \rangle_{J_+}$ to both sides gives

$$2 \langle Wf \rangle_J = W(J_-) W(J_+)^{-1} \langle Wf \rangle_{J_+} + \langle Wf \rangle_{J_+} = \left(W(J_-) W(J_+)^{-1} + W(J_+) W(J_+)^{-1} \right) \langle Wf \rangle_{J_+}.$$

Rearranging by factoring out $W(J_+)^{-1}$ on the right from the term in parentheses and using the definitions gives

$$\langle W\rangle_J^{-1}\langle Wf\rangle_J = \langle W\rangle_{J_+}^{-1}\langle Wf\rangle_{J_+}.$$

Solving (5) for $\langle Wf\rangle_{J_+}$ and using analogous arguments, one can show:

$$\langle W\rangle_J^{-1}\langle Wf\rangle_J = \langle W\rangle_{J_-}^{-1}\langle Wf\rangle_{J_-}.$$

Now fix any $x, y \in (0,\infty)$ and choose some dyadic interval J_0 so that $x, y \in J_0$. Define two sequence of dyadic intervals:

$$J_0 = I_0 \supsetneq I_1 \supsetneq I_2 \cdots \supsetneq I_i \supsetneq I_{i+1} \dots$$
$$J_0 = K_0 \supsetneq K_1 \supsetneq K_2 \cdots \supsetneq K_k \supsetneq K_{k+1} \dots$$

such that each I_i is a parent of I_{i+1} and $x \in I_i$ for all i and similarly, each K_k is a parent of K_{k+1} and y is in each K_k. Our previous arguments imply that

$$\langle W\rangle_{I_i}^{-1}\langle Wf\rangle_{I_i} = \langle W\rangle_{J_0}^{-1}\langle Wf\rangle_{J_0} = \langle W\rangle_{K_k}^{-1}\langle Wf\rangle_{K_k} \quad \forall i,k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Now we can use the Lebesgue Differentiation Theorem to conclude that

$$W(x)^{-1}W(x)f(x) = W(y)^{-1}W(y)f(y)$$

for almost every x, y in $(0,\infty)$ and so $f(x) = f(y)$ for almost every x, y in $[0,\infty)$. Analogous arguments imply f must be constant on $(-\infty, 0]$. But, by assumption, f is also orthogonal to the set $\{h_k^{W,i}\}$, which implies f is orthogonal to all of the nonzero constant functions supported on $[0,\infty)$ or $(-\infty,0]$ in $L^2(W)$. Thus, we can conclude $f \equiv 0$. □

We require one additional fact about the weighted Haar system:

Lemma 2.4. *The orthonormal system H_W satisfies*

$$\left\|W(J_-)^{\frac{1}{2}}h_J^{W,j}(J_-)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \le C(d)$$
$$\left\|W(J_+)^{\frac{1}{2}}h_J^{W,j}(J_+)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \le C(d)$$

for all $J \in \mathcal{D}$ and $1 \le j \le d$, where $h_J^{W,j}(J_\pm)$ is the constant value $h_J^{W,j}$ takes on $J_\pm$.

Proof. We only prove the first inequality as the second is proved similarly. First, recall that $W(J)W(J_+)^{-1}W(J_-)$ is a positive matrix and hence, $W(J_-)^{-1}W(J_+)W(J)^{-1}$ is positive as well. Now, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|W(J_-)^{\frac{1}{2}}h_J^{W,j}(J_-)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d}^2 &\le \left\|W(J_-)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(W(J)W(J_+)^{-1}W(J_-)\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\|^2 \\
&= \left\|W(J_-)^{\frac{1}{2}}W(J_-)^{-1}W(J_+)W(J)^{-1}W(J_-)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\| \\
&\le C(d)\ \mathrm{Tr}\left(W(J_-)^{\frac{1}{2}}W(J_-)^{-1}W(J_+)W(J)^{-1}W(J_-)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\
&= C(d)\ \mathrm{Tr}\left(W(J)^{-\frac{1}{2}}W(J_+)W(J)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\
&\le C(d)\left\|W(J)^{-\frac{1}{2}}W(J_+)W(J)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\| \\
&\le C(d)\left\|W(J)^{-\frac{1}{2}}W(J)W(J)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\| \\
&= C(d),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that trace and operator norm are equivalent (up to a dimensional constant) for positive matrices. This completes the proof. □

Remark 2.5. In the proofs of Theorems 4.2 and 4.3, we will expand functions in $L^2(W)$ with respect to the basis H_W. Specifically, if $f \in L^2(W)$, we can expand f as

$$f = \sum_{\substack{J\in\mathcal{D}\\1\le j\le d}} \left\langle f, h_J^{W,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} h_J^{W,j} + \sum_{\substack{1\le k\le 2\\1\le j\le p_k}} \left\langle f, h_k^{W,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} h_k^{W,j}.$$

This means that for $K \in \mathcal{D}$, we can express the weighted average of f on K as

$$\begin{aligned}\langle W\rangle_K^{-1}\langle Wf\rangle_K &= \sum_{\substack{J\in\mathcal{D}\\1\le j\le d}} \left\langle f, h_J^{W,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} \langle W\rangle_K^{-1}\left\langle Wh_J^{W,j}\right\rangle_K \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{1\le k\le 2\\1\le j\le p_k}} \left\langle f, h_k^{W,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} \langle W\rangle_K^{-1}\left\langle Wh_k^{W,j}\right\rangle_K \\ &= \sum_{\substack{J:K\subsetneq J\\1\le j\le d}} \left\langle f, h_J^{W,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} h_J^{W,j}(K) + \sum_{\substack{1\le k\le 2\\1\le j\le p_k}} \left\langle f, h_k^{W,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} h_k^{W,j}(K),\end{aligned}$$

where $h_J^{W,j}(K)$ is the constant value that $h_J^{W,j}$ takes on K and $h_k^{W,j}(K)$ is the constant value that $h_k^{W,j}$ takes on K. Now, assume f is compactly supported, so that we can find two dyadic intervals $I_1 \subset [0,\infty)$ and $I_2 \subset (-\infty, 0]$ such that $\operatorname{supp}(f) \subseteq I_1 \cup I_2$. For $I \in \mathcal{D}$, define the the weighted expectation of f on I by

$$E_I^W f \equiv \langle W\rangle_I^{-1}\langle Wf\rangle_I \mathbf{1}_I.$$

Then, we can write f as

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \sum_{\substack{J\in\mathcal{D}\\1\le j\le d}} \left\langle f, h_J^{W,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} h_J^{W,j} + \sum_{\substack{1\le k\le 2\\1\le j\le p_k}} \left\langle f, h_k^{W,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} h_k^{W,j} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{J:J\subseteq I_1\cup I_2\\1\le j\le d}} \left\langle f, h_J^{W,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} h_J^{W,j} + \sum_{1\le \ell\le 2} \langle W\rangle_{I_\ell}^{-1}\langle Wf\rangle_{I_\ell}\mathbf{1}_{I_\ell} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{J:J\subseteq I_1\cup I_2\\1\le j\le d}} \left\langle f, h_J^{W,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} h_J^{W,j} + \sum_{1\le \ell\le 2} E_{I_\ell}^W f. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

3. Matrix Carleson Embedding Theorem

Let W be a matrix weight such that for all positive semi-definite matrices A and intervals $J \in \mathcal{D}$, there is a uniform constant C satisfying

$$\frac{1}{|J|}\int_J \|AW(x)A\|dx \le C\left(\frac{1}{|J|}\int_J \|AW(x)A\|^{\frac{1}{2}}dx\right)^2. \tag{7}$$

Define $[W]_{R_2}$ to be the smallest such constant C. Treil-Volberg's arguments in Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6 in [14] show that, if W is an A_2 matrix weight, then

$$[W]_{R_2} \le C(d)[W]_{A_2}. \tag{8}$$

In Theorem 6.1 in [14], Treil-Volberg prove an embedding theorem for a specific sequence of positive semi-definite matrices. Their arguments generalize easily to arbitrary sequences of matrices, yielding the following matrix Carleson Embedding Theorem:

Theorem 3.1. *Let W be a matrix weight satisfying (7) and let $\{A_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ be a sequence of positive semi-definite $d\times d$ matrices. Then*

$$\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \left\langle A_I \left\langle f\right\rangle_I, \left\langle f\right\rangle_I\right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \leq C_1 \left\|f\right\|^2_{L^2(W^{-1})} \quad \text{if } \frac{1}{|J|}\sum_{I:I\subseteq J} \left\|\left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{\frac{1}{2}} A_I \left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\| \leq C_2 \ \ \forall J\in\mathcal{D},$$

where $C_1 = C_2 C(d)[W]_{R_2}$ and $C(d)$ is a dimensional constant.

It should be noted that in [5], Isralowitz-Kwon-Pott obtained a more general version of Theorem 3.1, which holds for all A_p matrix weights.

Remark 3.2. Treil-Volberg's arguments in [14] actually establish a seemingly stronger result. Namely, they show that if $\{B_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a sequence of positive semi-definite matrices, then

(9)
$$\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \left\|\left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_I \left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\| \left\|\left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\langle W^{\frac{1}{2}} g\right\rangle_I\right\|^2_{\mathbb{C}^d} \leq C_1\|g\|^2_{L^2} \text{ if } \frac{1}{|J|}\sum_{I:I\subseteq J} \left\|\left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_I \left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\| \leq C_2,$$

for all $J\in\mathcal{D}$. To recover Theorem 3.1 from (9), note that

$$\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \left\langle \left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{-1} B_I \left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{-1} \left\langle W^{\frac{1}{2}} g\right\rangle_I, \left\langle W^{\frac{1}{2}} g\right\rangle_I\right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \leq \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \left\|\left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_I \left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\| \left\|\left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\langle W^{\frac{1}{2}} g\right\rangle_I\right\|^2_{\mathbb{C}^d}.$$

If one is given $\{A_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ and $f\in L^2(W^{-1})$, then pairing the above inequality with (9) using $B_I \equiv \left\langle W\right\rangle_I A_I \left\langle W\right\rangle_I$ and $g\equiv W^{-\frac{1}{2}} f$ gives the inequalities in Theorem 3.1.

Equation (9) is proved via arguments similar to those used in [13] to establish the standard Carleson Embedding Theorem. Specifically, Treil-Volberg define an associated embedding operator and show it is bounded using the Senichkin-Vinogradov Test:

Theorem 3.3 (Senichkin-Vinogradov Test)**.** *Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be a measure space, and let k be a locally summable, nonnegative, measurable function on $\mathcal{Z}\times\mathcal{Z}$. If*

$$\int_{\mathcal{Z}} k(s,t)k(s,x)\,ds \leq C\left[k(x,t)+k(t,x)\right] \quad \text{a.e. on } \mathcal{Z},$$

then for all nonnegative $g\in L^2(\mathcal{Z})$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{Z}}\int_{\mathcal{Z}} k(s,t)g(s)g(t)\,dsdt \leq 2C\|g\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{Z})}.$$

For the ease of the reader, we sketch the proof of (9). We focus on the first half of the proof, as the second half is given in detail in [14].

Proof. First define $\mu_I \equiv \left\|\left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} B_I \left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\|$. Then, by assumption, $\{\mu_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a scalar Carleson sequence with testing constant C_2. Define the embedding operator $\mathcal{J}: L^2 \to \ell^2(\{\mu_I\},\mathbb{C}^d)$ by

$$\mathcal{J}f = \left\{\left\langle W\right\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\langle W^{\frac{1}{2}} f\right\rangle_I\right\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$$

and observe that (9) is equivalent to $\mathcal{J}$ having operator norm bounded by $\sqrt{C_1}$. To prove the norm bound, one shows that the formal adjoint $\mathcal{J}^* : \ell^2(\{\mu_I\}, \mathbb{C}^d) \to L^2$ defined by

$$\mathcal{J}^*\{\alpha_I\} \equiv \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \frac{\mu_I}{|I|} \mathbf{1}_I W^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_I \qquad \forall\ \{\alpha_I\} \in \ell^2\left(\{\mu_I\}, \mathbb{C}^d\right)$$

has the desired norm bound. First observe that

$$\mathcal{J}\mathcal{J}^*\{\alpha_I\} = \left\{ \langle W\rangle_J^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \frac{\mu_I}{|I|} \langle W\mathbf{1}_I\rangle_J \langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_I \right\}_{J\in\mathcal{D}}.$$

One can use this to immediately show that for any $\{\alpha_I\}$ in $\ell^2(\{\mu_I\}, \mathbb{C}^d)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{J}^*\{\alpha_I\}\|_{L^2}^2 &= \langle \mathcal{J}\mathcal{J}^*\{\alpha_I\}, \{\alpha_I\}\rangle_{\ell^2(\{\mu_I\},\mathbb{C}^d)} \\ &= \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I:I\subseteq J} \frac{\mu_I\mu_J}{|J|} \left\langle \langle W\rangle_J^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_I^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_I, \alpha_J \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} + \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{J:J\subsetneq I} \frac{\mu_I\mu_J}{|I|} \left\langle \langle W\rangle_J^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_I, \alpha_J \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}.\end{aligned}$$

Now, for $K, L \in \mathcal{D}$, define T_{LK} by

$$T_{LK} \equiv \frac{1}{|L|} \left\| \langle W\rangle_K^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| = \frac{1}{|L|} \left\| \langle W\rangle_L^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_K^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|$$

if $K \subseteq L$ and $T_{KL} = 0$ otherwise. By symmetry in the sums, it is easy to show that

$$\|\mathcal{J}^*\{\alpha_I\}\|_{L^2}^2 \le 2 \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I:I\subseteq J} \mu_I\mu_J T_{JI} \|\alpha_I\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \|\alpha_J\|_{\mathbb{C}^d}. \tag{10}$$

Thus, the result will be proved if one can show that the righthand side of (10) is bounded by $C_1\|\{\alpha_I\}\|_{\ell^2(\{\mu_I\},\mathbb{C}^d)}^2$. This is where one uses the Senichkin-Vinogradov Test. Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be $\mathcal{D}$, the set of dyadic intervals, with point mass μ_I on each interval I. Then, $L^2(\mathcal{Z})$ is equivalent to $\ell^2(\{\mu_I\}, \mathbb{C})$. Indeed, $\{\beta_I\} \in \ell^2(\{\mu_I\}, \mathbb{C})$ if and only if the function β defined by $\beta(I) = \beta_I$ is in $L^2(\mathcal{Z})$. Moreover,

$$\|\{\beta_I\}\|_{\ell^2(\mu_I,\mathbb{C})} = \|\beta\|_{L^2(\mathcal{Z})},$$

so we can treat these as the same objects. Now, define the nonnegative function $k : \mathcal{Z}\times\mathcal{Z} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ by

$$k(K, L) \equiv \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I:I\subseteq J} T_{JI}\delta_I(K)\delta_J(L),$$

where $\delta_I(K) = 1$ if $K = I$ and zero otherwise. Fix a sequence $\{\alpha_I\} \in \ell^2(\{\mu_I\}, \mathbb{C}^d)$. Then the sequence $\{a_I\}$ defined by $a_I \equiv \|\alpha_I\|_{\mathbb{C}^d}$ is a nonnegative sequence in $\ell^2(\{\mu_I\}, \mathbb{C})$ or equivalently, a (defined by $a(I) = a_I$) is a nonnegative function in $L^2(\mathcal{Z})$, and the norms of the two sequences are equal. It is easy to show that

$$\int_{\mathcal{Z}}\int_{\mathcal{Z}} k(K, L)a(K)a(L)\, dKdL = \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I:I\subseteq J} \mu_I\mu_J T_{JI}a_Ia_J = \sum_{J\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{I:I\subseteq J} \mu_I\mu_J T_{JI}\|\alpha_I\|_{\mathbb{C}^d}\|\alpha_J\|_{\mathbb{C}^d},$$

which is exactly the object we need to control. Indeed, if we can establish the conditions of the Senichkin-Vinogradov test with constant C_1, then the result will be proved. Let us first rewrite the desired conditions. The definition of k implies that

$$\int_{\mathcal{Z}} k(K, J)k(K, J')\, dK = \sum_{I:I\subseteq J,J'} T_{JI}T_{J'I}\mu_I \qquad \forall\ J, J' \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Again using the definition of k, we have

$$k(J,J') + k(J',J) = T_{JJ'} + T_{J'J} \qquad \forall\ J, J' \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Since we only sum over dyadic $I \subseteq J \cap J'$, to have a nonzero sum, we must have $J \subseteq J'$ or $J' \subseteq J$. Without loss of generality, assume $J' \subseteq J$. Then, to establish the conditions of the Senichkin-Vinogradov test, one must simple show:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{I:I\subseteq J'} T_{JI}T_{J'I}\mu_I &= \sum_{I:I\subseteq J'} \mu_I \frac{1}{|J|}\left\|\langle W\rangle_J^{-\frac{1}{2}}\langle W\rangle_I^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\| \frac{1}{|J'|}\left\|\langle W\rangle_{J'}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\langle W\rangle_I^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\| \\ &\leq C_1 \frac{1}{|J|}\left\|\langle W\rangle_J^{-\frac{1}{2}}\langle W\rangle_{J'}^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|.\end{aligned}$$

This inequality is proven in detail in [14]. The proof uses simple results about matrix weights including the fact that all matrix A_2 weights satisfy a reverse Hölder estimate as in (7). The reverse Hölder estimate is used to turn the sum of interest into a sum of averages of a function weighted by the constants μ_I. Since $\{\mu_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ is a scalar Carleson sequence, one can use the scalar Carleson Embedding Theorem to complete the proof. □

Using Theorem 3.1 and ideas from [5], we now obtain the following Carleson Embedding Theorem. Its testing conditions are particularly well-suited to the objects appearing in the proofs of Theorems 4.2 and 4.3, the well-localized analogues of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

Theorem 3.4. *Let W be an A_2 weight and let $\{A_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{D}}$ be a sequence of positive semi-definite $d\times d$ matrices. Then*

$$\sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \left\langle A_I \langle f\rangle_I, \langle f\rangle_I\right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \leq C_1 \|f\|^2_{L^2(W^{-1})} \quad \textit{if} \quad \frac{1}{|J|}\sum_{I:I\subseteq J} \langle W\rangle_I A_I \langle W\rangle_I \leq C_2 \langle W\rangle_J \quad \forall J\in\mathcal{D},$$

where $C_1 = C_2 C(d)[W]_{R_2}[W]_{A_2}$.

The existence of Theorem 3.4, albeit with a different constant, is mentioned by Isralowitz-Kwon-Pott in the final remarks of [5]. Indeed, according to these remarks, if one modifies their previous arguments and tracks all constants closely, one could obtain this Carleson Embedding Theorem with constant $C(d)[W]^2_{A_2}$. However, in light of Equation (8), our constant is very likely smaller than the one appearing in [5]. As the details of the proof are not given in [5] and we obtain a different constant, we include the proof here.

Remark 3.5. In Theorems 1.2, 1.3 and Theorems 4.2, 4.3, the constants $B(W)$ and $B(V)$ appear. Since dimensional constants are already included in the statement of those theorems, it should be clear from Theorem 3.4 that

$$B(W) = [W]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{R_2}[W]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{A_2} \quad \text{and} \quad B(V) = [V]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{R_2}[V]^{\frac{1}{2}}_{A_2}.$$

Now, to prove Theorem 3.4, we need the decaying stopping tree from Isralowitz-Kwon-Pott. Specifically, fix $I\in\mathcal{D}$ and let $\mathcal{J}(I)$ be the collection of maximal dyadic $J\subseteq I$ such that

$$\left\|\langle W\rangle_J^{-\frac{1}{2}}\langle W\rangle_I^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|^2 > \lambda \quad \text{or} \quad \left\|\langle W\rangle_J^{\frac{1}{2}}\langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\|^2 > \lambda,$$

for $\lambda > 1$ to be determined later. Set $\mathcal{F}(I)$ to be the collection of $J\subseteq I$ such that J is not contained in any interval in $\mathcal{J}(I)$. It is clear that I is always in $\mathcal{F}(I)$. Set $\mathcal{J}^0(I) \equiv \{I\}$.

Inductively define $\mathcal{J}^j(I)$ and $\mathcal{F}^j(I)$ by

$$\mathcal{J}^j(I) = \bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{J}^{j-1}(I)} \mathcal{J}(J) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}^j(I) = \bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{J}^{j-1}(I)} \mathcal{F}(J).$$

One can then prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6 (Lemma 2.1, [5]). *Given the stopping-tree set-up, if $\lambda = 4C(d)[W]_{A_2}$, then*

$$\left|\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{J}^j(I)} \mathcal{J}(J)\right| \leq 2^{-j}|I| \quad \forall I \in \mathcal{D}.$$

We can now provide the proof of Theorem 3.4:

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Using the equivalence, up to a dimensional constant, of norm and trace for positive semi-definite matrices, our hypothesis implies

$$\sum_{I:I\subseteq K} \left\| \langle W\rangle_K^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_I A_I \langle W\rangle_I \langle W\rangle_K^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \lesssim C_2|K| \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{D}.$$

We will use this to obtain the testing condition from Theorem 3.1. Specifically, fix $J \in \mathcal{D}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{|J|}\sum_{I:I\subseteq J} \left\| \langle W\rangle_I^{\frac{1}{2}} A_I \langle W\rangle_I^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| &= \frac{1}{|J|}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{K\in\mathcal{J}^{j-1}(J)} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}(K)} \left\| \langle W\rangle_I^{\frac{1}{2}} A_I \langle W\rangle_I^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{|J|}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{K\in\mathcal{J}^{j-1}(J)} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}(K)} \left\| \langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_K^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \left\| \langle W\rangle_K^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_I A_I \langle W\rangle_I \langle W\rangle_K^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \left\| \langle W\rangle_K^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\
&= \frac{1}{|J|}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{K\in\mathcal{J}^{j-1}(J)} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}(K)} \left\| \langle W\rangle_K^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|^2 \left\| \langle W\rangle_K^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_I A_I \langle W\rangle_I \langle W\rangle_K^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\
&\lesssim \frac{[W]_{A_2}}{|J|}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{K\in\mathcal{J}^{j-1}(J)} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}(K)} \left\| \langle W\rangle_K^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_I A_I \langle W\rangle_I \langle W\rangle_K^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{[W]_{A_2}}{|J|}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{K\in\mathcal{J}^{j-1}(J)} \sum_{I:I\subseteq K} \left\| \langle W\rangle_K^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_I A_I \langle W\rangle_I \langle W\rangle_K^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\
&\lesssim \frac{C_2[W]_{A_2}}{|J|}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{K\in\mathcal{J}^{j-1}(J)} |K| \\
&\leq C_2[W]_{A_2}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j} \\
&= C_2[W]_{A_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the fourth line from the top we use the stopping criteria, which introduces the value $[W]_{A_2}$. Pairing this estimate with Theorem 3.1 gives the desired result. □

Remark 3.7. As mentioned in [5], one can prove a version of Lemma 3.6 for $A_{2,\infty}$ weights using Lemma 3.1 in [15]. Recall from [15] that W is an $A_{2,\infty}$ weight if there is some constant C such that

$$e^{\frac{1}{|I|}\int_I \log \|W(t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}x\|dt} \leq C \left\|\langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} x\right\|, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{C}^d,\ I \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Denote the smallest such C by $[W]_{A_{2,\infty}}$. As is shown in [15], if $W \in A_2$, then $W \in A_{2,\infty}$ with $[W]_{A_{2,\infty}} \leq [W]_{A_2}$. If one tracks the constant in Lemma 3.1 from [15] and uses it in the proof of Lemma 2.1 in [5], one can obtain Lemma 3.6 with $\lambda = C(d)[W]_{A_{2,\infty}}^{2d}$. Then the proof of Theorem 3.4 immediately shows that Theorem 3.4 also holds with constant $C_1 = C_2 C(d)[W]_{R_2}[W]_{A_{2,\infty}}^{2d}$.

4. Well-Localized Operators

We say an operator T_W acts formally from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$ if the bilinear form

$$\langle T_W \mathbf{1}_I e, \mathbf{1}_J v\rangle_{L^2(V)}$$

is given for all $I, J \in \mathcal{D}$ and $e, v \in \mathbb{C}^d$ is well-defined. Then, the formal adjoint T_V^* is defined by

$$\langle T_V^* \mathbf{1}_I e, \mathbf{1}_J v\rangle_{L^2(W)} \equiv \langle \mathbf{1}_I e, T_W \mathbf{1}_J v\rangle_{L^2(V)}.$$

Given this, we can define:

Definition 4.1. An operator T_W acting (formally) from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$ is called *r-lower triangular* if for all $1 \leq j \leq d$ and $I, J \in \mathcal{D}$ with $|J| \leq 2|I|$ and all $e \in \mathbb{C}^d$, T_W satisfies

$$\left\langle T_W \mathbf{1}_I e, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} = 0$$

whenever $J \not\subset I^{(r+1)}$ or $|J| \leq 2^{-r}|I|$ and $J \not\subset I$. Here, $\left\{h_J^{V,j}\right\}$ is the set of V-weighted Haar functions on J as defined in (4) and $I^{(r+1)}$ is the $(r+1)^{th}$ ancestor of I. We say T_W is *well-localized with radius r* if both T_W and its formal adjoint T_V^* are r-lower triangular.

This definition of well-localized is slightly different than the one appearing in [11]. Indeed, to define lower triangular, Nazarov-Treil-Volberg only impose conditions on T_W when $|J| \leq |I|$, rather than $|J| \leq 2|I|$. Nevertheless, their ideas are clearly the correct ones and their definition is essentially correct; the difference is likely attributable to a typographical error. Still, after the establishing the related proofs, we do point out the necessity of having conditions for $|J| \leq 2|I|$ in Remark 5.5.

The main results about well-localized operators are the following two theorems, which are the well-localized analogues of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3:

Theorem 4.2. *Let V, W be matrix A_2 weights, and assume T_W is a well-localized operator of radius r acting formally from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$. Then T_W extends to a bounded operator from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$ if and only if*

$$\|T_W \mathbf{1}_I e\|_{L^2(V)} \leq A_1 \langle W(I)e, e\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$\|T_V^* \mathbf{1}_I e\|_{L^2(W)} \leq A_2 \langle V(I)e, e\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for all $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and $e \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Furthermore,

$$\|T_W\|_{L^2(W)\to L^2(V)} \leq 2^{2r} C(d) \left(A_1 B(W) + A_2 B(V)\right),$$

where $C(d)$ is a dimensional constant and $B(W)$ and $B(V)$ are constants depending on W and V from an application of the matrix Carleson Embedding Theorem.

Theorem 4.3. *Let V, W be matrix A_2 weights, and assume T_W is a well-localized operator of radius r acting formally from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$. Then T_W extends to a bounded operator from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$ if and only if the following two conditions hold:*

(i) For all intervals $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and $e \in \mathbb{C}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{1}_I T_W \mathbf{1}_I e\|_{L^2(V)} &\leq A_1 \langle W(I)e, e\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \|\mathbf{1}_I T_V^* \mathbf{1}_I e\|_{L^2(W)} &\leq A_2 \langle V(I)e, e\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) For all intervals I, J in $\mathcal{D}$ satisfying $2^{-r}|I| \leq |J| \leq 2^r|I|$ and vectors e, ν in $\mathbb{C}^d$,

$$\left|\langle T_W \mathbf{1}_I e, \mathbf{1}_J \nu\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \leq A_3 \langle W(I)e, e\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle V(J)\nu, \nu\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\|T_W\|_{L^2(W)\to L^2(V)} \leq 2^{2r} C(d) \left(A_1 B(W) + A_2 B(V) + A_3\right),$$

where $C(d)$ is a dimensional constant and $B(W)$ and $B(V)$ are constants depending on W and V from an application of the matrix Carleson Embedding Theorem.

Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 will follow immediately from these theorems once we establish the following lemma:

Lemma 4.4. *If V, W are matrix weights whose entries are in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ and if T is a band operator of radius r, then T_W is a well-localized operator of radius r acting formally from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$.*

Proof. Assume $T : L^2 \to L^2$ is a band operator with radius r, and W, V are matrix weights whose entries are in L^2_{loc}. Then the operators

$$T_W \equiv T M_W \quad \text{and} \quad T_V^* \equiv T^* M_V$$

act formally from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$ and $L^2(V)$ to $L^2(W)$ respectively since

$$\langle TW\mathbf{1}_I e, V\mathbf{1}_J \nu\rangle_{L^2} = \langle T_W \mathbf{1}_I e, \mathbf{1}_J \nu\rangle_{L^2(V)} \text{ and } \langle W\mathbf{1}_I e, T^* V \mathbf{1}_J \nu\rangle_{L^2} = \langle \mathbf{1}_I e, T_V^* \mathbf{1}_J \nu\rangle_{L^2(W)}$$

are well-defined. To show T_W is a well-localized operator with radius r, by symmetry, it suffices to show that T_W is r-lower triangular. First, fix an orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^d$ of $\mathbb{C}^d$ and for $I \in \mathcal{D}$, define $H_I \equiv \{h_I e_i\}_{1\leq i\leq d}$. Then we can write

$$T = \sum_{I,J\in\mathcal{D}} T_{IJ} \quad \text{where} \quad T_{IJ} : H_I \to H_J,$$

and each T_{IJ} is given by

$$T_{IJ} = \sum_{1\leq i,j\leq d} \langle T h_I e_i, h_J e_j\rangle_{L^2} \langle \cdot, h_I e_i\rangle_{L^2} h_J e_j.$$

Since the entries of W are in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$, then $W\mathbf{1}_I e$ is in L^2 and so, $T_W\mathbf{1}_I e \equiv TW\mathbf{1}_I e$ makes sense for each $I \in \mathcal{D}$ and $e \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Given $h_J^{V,j}$, a vector-valued Haar function on J adapted to V, one can write:

$$\left\langle T_W\mathbf{1}_I e, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} = \left\langle T_W\mathbf{1}_I e, Vh_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2} \leq \|T_W\mathbf{1}_I e\|_{L^2}\left\|Vh_J^{V,j}\right\|_{L^2} < \infty,$$

where the first term is bounded because T is bounded on L^2 and the second term is bounded because $h_J^{V,j}$ is bounded and the entries of V are in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$. Given that, we are justified in expanding T with respect to the Haar basis to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle T_W\mathbf{1}_I e, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} &= \sum_{K,L\in\mathcal{D}}\left\langle T_{KL}W\mathbf{1}_I e, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \\ &= \sum_{K,L\in\mathcal{D}}\sum_{1\leq k,\ell\leq d}\langle Th_K e_k, h_L e_\ell\rangle_{L^2}\langle W\mathbf{1}_I e, h_K e_k\rangle_{L^2}\left\langle h_L e_\ell, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}.\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\left\langle T_{KL}W\mathbf{1}_I e, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}$ is zero if $d_{\text{tree}}(K,L) > r$, if $I\cap K = \emptyset$, or if $L \not\subset J$. So, we only need consider terms where $d_{\text{tree}}(K,L) \leq r$, $I\cap K \neq \emptyset$, and $L \subseteq J$.

To show T_W is r-lower triangular let $|J| \leq 2|I|$. First, assume that $J \not\subset I^{(r+1)}$ and by contradiction, assume there is a nonzero term $\left\langle T_{KL}W\mathbf{1}_I e, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}$ in the above sum for some $K, L \in \mathcal{D}$. By our previous assertions, we must have

$$|K| \leq 2^r|L| \leq 2^r|J| \leq 2^{r+1}|I|.$$

Since $I\cap K \neq \emptyset$, this implies that $K \subseteq I^{(r+1)}$. Since $L \subseteq J$, $|L| \leq 2|I|$ and $L \not\subset I^{(r+1)}$. But, this immediately implies that $d_{tree}(K,L) \geq r+1$, a contradiction.

Similarly, assume $|J| \leq 2^{-r}|I|$ and $J \not\subset I$ and by contradiction, assume there is a nonzero term $\left\langle T_{KL}W\mathbf{1}_I e, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}$ for some K, L. Then $|L| \leq 2^{-r}|I|$ and $L \not\subset I$. Furthermore, since $d_{\text{tree}}(K,L) \leq r$, this implies $|K| \leq |I|$, so $K \subseteq I$. But $|L| \leq 2^{-r}|I|$, $L \not\subset I$, and $K \subseteq I$ implies that $d_{\text{tree}}(K,L) \geq r+1$, a contradiction.

Thus, T_W is r-lower triangular and symmetric arguments give the result for T_V^*. This implies T_W is well-localized with radius r. □

Remark 4.5. In Theorems 4.2 and 4.3, one must interpret the testing conditions correctly when the matrix weights' entries are not in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$. We already outlined the remedy for this problem in Remark 1.5. Similarly, one should notice that Lemma 4.4 only handles the case where the matrix weights have entries in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$. Nevertheless, this result is sufficient to allow us to pass from Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 to Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. This is easy to see since, as detailed in Remark 1.5, we interpret all statements about weights with locally integrable (but not necessary square-integrable) entries in Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 using limits of weights with entries in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$.

5. Proofs of Theorems 4.2 and 4.3

5.1. **Paraproducts.** To prove Theorems 4.2 and 4.3, we require several results about related paraproducts. As before, let T_W be a well-localized operator of radius r acting formally from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$ with formal adjoint T_V^*. Using these operators, define the following

paraproducts:

$$\Pi^W f \equiv \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le d\\ J\subseteq I:|J|=2^{-r}|I|}} \left\langle T_W E_I^W f, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} h_J^{V,j}$$

$$\Pi^V g \equiv \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le d\\ J\subseteq I:|J|=2^{-r}|I|}} \left\langle T_V^* E_I^V g, h_J^{W,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} h_J^{W,j}$$

for $f \in L^2(W)$ and $g \in L^2(V)$. Recall that the W-weighted expectation of f on I is defined by $E_I^W f \equiv \langle W\rangle_I^{-1} \langle Wf\rangle_I \mathbf{1}_I$. Now, observe that, as demonstrated by the following lemma, these paraproducts mimic the behavior of T_W and T_V^* respectively.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $I, J \in \mathcal{D}$ and let Π^W be the paraproduct defined above using the well-localized operator T_W with radius r acting (formally) from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$.*

1. *If $|J| \ge 2^{-r}|I|$, then*

$$\left\langle \Pi^W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} = 0 \qquad \forall\ 1 \le i, j \le d.$$

2. *If $|J| < 2^{-r}|I|$, then*

$$\left\langle \Pi^W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} = \left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \qquad \forall\ 1 \le i, j \le d.$$

   If $J \not\subset I$, then both sides of the equality are zero.

Furthermore, analogous statements hold for the paraproduct Π^V and formal adjoint T_V^*.

Proof. First, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle \Pi^W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{1\le \ell\le d\\ L\subseteq K:|L|=2^{-r}|K|}} \left\langle T_W E_K^W h_I^{W,i}, h_L^{V,\ell}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \left\langle h_L^{V,\ell}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\\ &= \left\langle T_W E_{J^{(r)}}^W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)},\end{aligned}$$

where $J^{(r)}$ is the r^{th} ancestor of J. Now assume $|J| \ge 2^{-r}|I|$ or $J \not\subset I$. Then, either $I \subseteq J^{(r)}$ or $I \cap J^{(r)} = \emptyset$. In either case,

$$E_{J^{(r)}}^W h_I^{W,i} = 0,$$

so the corresponding inner product is zero. Now assume $|J| < 2^{-r}|I|$, so that $|J| \le 2^{-r}|I_-| = 2^{-r}|I_+|$. If $J \not\subset I$, then $J \not\subset I_-, I_+$ and since T_W is well-localized with radius r,

$$\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} = \left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}(I_-)\mathbf{1}_{I_-}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} + \left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}(I_+)\mathbf{1}_{I_+}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} = 0.$$

This gives equality if $J \not\subset I$. Now assume $|J| < 2^{-r}|I|$ and $J \subseteq I$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle \Pi^W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} &= \left\langle T_W E_{J^{(r)}}^W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\\ &= \left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}\left(J^{(r)}\right)\mathbf{1}_{J^{(r)}}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\\ &= \left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)},\end{aligned}$$

since for all $I' \subset I \setminus J^{(r)}$, the tree distance $d_{\text{tree}}(I', J) > r$ and so

$$\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}(I')\, \mathbf{1}_{I'}, h_J^{V,j} \right\rangle_{L^2(V)} = 0.$$

Analogous statements hold for Π^V, since it is defined using the operator T_V^*, which is also well-localized with radius r. □

Now, we show that the testing condition (i) from Theorem 4.3 and hence, the stronger testing condition from Theorem 4.2, implies the boundedness of the paraproducts Π^W and Π^V. We state the result for Π^W, but analogous arguments give the result for Π^V.

Lemma 5.2. *Let Π^W be the paraproduct defined above and assume that the well-localized operator T_W satisfies:*

$$\|\mathbf{1}_I T_W \mathbf{1}_I e\|_{L^2(V)} \leq C \langle W(I)e, e\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}} \qquad \forall I \in \mathcal{D},\ e \in \mathbb{C}^d.$$

Then Π^W is bounded from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$ and

$$\left\|\Pi^W\right\|_{L^2(W)\to L^2(V)} \leq CB(W),$$

where $B(W)$ is the constant obtained from applying the matrix Carleson Embedding Theorem.

Proof. Fix $f \in L^2(W)$, which implies $Wf \in L^2(W^{-1})$, and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\Pi^W f\right\|_{L^2(V)}^2 &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{1\leq \ell\leq d \\ L\subseteq K: |L|=2^{-r}|K|}} \left| \left\langle T_W E_K^W f, h_L^{V,\ell} \right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \right|^2 \\
&= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{1\leq \ell\leq d \\ L\subseteq K: |L|=2^{-r}|K|}} \left| \left\langle E_K^W f, T_V^* h_L^{V,\ell} \right\rangle_{L^2(W)} \right|^2 \\
&= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{1\leq \ell\leq d \\ L\subseteq K: |L|=2^{-r}|K|}} \left| \left\langle \langle W\rangle_K^{-1} \langle Wf\rangle_K, \alpha_{L,\ell} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \right|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have set $\alpha_{L,\ell}$ to be the vector

$$\alpha_{L,\ell} \equiv \int_{L^{(r)}} W(x) T_V^* h_L^{V,\ell}(x)\, dx.$$

And so, letting $(\alpha_{L,\ell})^*$ denote the $1 \times d$ adjoint row vector corresponding to $\alpha_{L,\ell}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\Pi^W f\right\|_{L^2(V)}^2 &= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{D}} \sum_{\substack{1\leq \ell\leq d \\ L\subseteq K: |L|=2^{-r}|K|}} \left\langle \alpha_{L,\ell} (\alpha_{L,\ell})^* \langle W\rangle_K^{-1} \langle Wf\rangle_K, \langle W\rangle_K^{-1} \langle Wf\rangle_K \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\
&= \sum_{K\in\mathcal{D}} \left\langle A_K \langle Wf\rangle_K, \langle Wf\rangle_K \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have set

$$A_K \equiv \sum_{\substack{1\leq \ell\leq d \\ L\subseteq K: |L|=2^{-r}|K|}} \langle W\rangle_K^{-1} \alpha_{L,\ell} (\alpha_{L,\ell})^* \langle W\rangle_K^{-1}.$$

This is exactly the setup where we can apply Theorem 3.4. Specifically, we need to show that for all $J \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\sum_{K \subseteq J} \langle W \rangle_K A_K \langle W \rangle_K \leq C^2 W(J).$$

To prove this matrix inequality, fix $e \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{K \subseteq J} \langle \langle W \rangle_K A_K \langle W \rangle_K e, e \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} &= \sum_{K \subseteq J} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \ell \leq d \\ L \subseteq K : |L| = 2^{-r}|K|}} \langle \alpha_{L,\ell} (\alpha_{L,\ell})^* e, e \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\
&= \sum_{K \subseteq J} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \ell \leq d \\ L \subseteq K : |L| = 2^{-r}|K|}} \left| \langle \alpha_{L,\ell}, e \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \right|^2 \\
&= \sum_{K \subseteq J} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \ell \leq d \\ L \subseteq K : |L| = 2^{-r}|K|}} \left| \left\langle h_L^{V,\ell}, T_W e \mathbf{1}_K \right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \right|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that as T is r-lower triangular and $L \subseteq K$ with $|L| = 2^{-r}|K|$, we have that

$$\left\langle h_L^{V,\ell}, T_W e \mathbf{1}_{J \setminus K} \right\rangle_{L^2(V)} = \sum_{I \subseteq J : I \neq K, |I| = |K|} \left\langle h_L^{V,\ell}, T_W e \mathbf{1}_I \right\rangle_{L^2(V)} = 0.$$

This means that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{K \subseteq J} \langle \langle W \rangle_K A_K \langle W \rangle_K e, e \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} &= \sum_{K \subseteq J} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \ell \leq d \\ L \subseteq K : |L| = 2^{-r}|K|}} \left| \left\langle h_L^{V,\ell}, T_W e \mathbf{1}_J \right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \right|^2 \\
&\leq \| \mathbf{1}_J T_W e \mathbf{1}_J \|_{L^2(V)}^2 \\
&\leq C^2 \langle W(J) e, e \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $e \in \mathbb{C}^d$ was arbitrary, the matrix inequality follows, so we can apply Theorem 3.4 to obtain:

$$\|\Pi^W f\|_{L^2(V)}^2 = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{D}} \langle A_K \langle W f \rangle_K, \langle W f \rangle_K \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d} \leq C^2 B(W)^2 \|W f\|_{L^2(W^{-1})}^2 = C^2 B(W)^2 \|f\|_{L^2(W)}^2,$$

as desired. □

5.2. **Small Lemmas.** In this subsection, we verify several small lemmas that are trivial in the scalar situation. As before, T_W is a well-localized operator with radius r that satisfies the testing conditions from Theorem 4.2 or 4.3.

Lemma 5.3. *Let T_W be a well-localized operator with radius r acting (formally) from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$ that satisfies the testing condition from Theorem 4.2 with constant A_1. Then*

$$\left| \left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j} \right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \right| \leq C(d) A_1 \qquad \forall I, J \in \mathcal{D}, 1 \leq i, j \leq d.$$

Similarly, if T_W satisfies the testing condition (ii) from Theorem 4.3 with constant A_3, then

$$\left| \left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j} \right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \right| \leq C(d) A_3 \qquad \forall I, J \in \mathcal{D}, 1 \leq i, j \leq d.$$

Proof. For the first part of the lemma, we can use Cauchy-Schwarz to obtain:

$$\left|\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \leq \left\|T_W h_I^{W,i}\right\|_{L^2(V)} \leq \left\|T_W h_I^{W,i}(I_-)\mathbf{1}_{I_-}\right\|_{L^2(V)} + \left\|T_W h_I^{W,i}(I_+)\mathbf{1}_{I_+}\right\|_{L^2(V)}.$$

It suffices to prove the desired bound for one term in the sum, since the arguments are symmetric. Using the testing condition and Lemma 2.4, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|T_W h_I^{W,i}(I_-)\,\mathbf{1}_{I_-}\right\|_{L^2(V)} &\leq A_1 \left\langle W(I_-) h_I^{W,i}(I_-), h_I^{W,i}(I_-)\right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= A_1 \left\|W(I_-)^{\frac{1}{2}} h_I^{W,i}(I_-)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\ &\leq C(d) A_1,\end{aligned}$$

which completes the first part of the lemma. For the second part, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \leq{}& \left|\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}(I_-)\mathbf{1}_{I_-}, h_J^{V,j}(J_-)\mathbf{1}_{J_-}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| + \left|\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}(I_-)\mathbf{1}_{I_-}, h_J^{V,j}(J_+)\mathbf{1}_{J_+}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \\ &+ \left|\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}(I_+)\mathbf{1}_{I_+}, h_J^{V,j}(J_-)\mathbf{1}_{J_-}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| + \left|\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}(I_+)\mathbf{1}_{I_+}, h_J^{V,j}(J_+)\mathbf{1}_{J_+}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right|.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.4 and testing hypothesis (ii), we can conclude:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}(I_-)\mathbf{1}_{I_-}, h_J^{V,j}(J_-)\mathbf{1}_{J_-}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| &\leq A_3 \left\langle W(I_-) h_I^{W,i}(I_-), h_I^{W,i}(I_-)\right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\langle V(I_-) h_J^{V,j}(J_-), h_J^{V,j}(J_-)\right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= A_3 \left\|W(I_-)^{\frac{1}{2}} h_I^{W,i}(I_-)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \left\|V(I_-)^{\frac{1}{2}} h_J^{V,j}(I_-)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\ &\leq C(d) A_3.\end{aligned}$$

The other three terms in the sum can be handled similarly. □

Lemma 5.4. *Let $f \in L^2(W)$. Then for all $I \in \mathcal{D}$,*

$$|I|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\|\langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle Wf\rangle_I\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \leq C(d) \left\|f \mathbf{1}_I\right\|_{L^2(W)}.$$

Proof. Using Hölder's inequality and the fact that $\langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} W(x) \langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is positive a.e., we can compute

$$\begin{aligned}|I| \left\|\langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle Wf\rangle_I\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d}^2 &= |I|^{-1} \left\|\int_I \langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} W(x) f(x)\, dx\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d}^2 \\ &\leq |I|^{-1} \left(\int_I \left\|\langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} W(x) f(x)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} dx\right)^2 \\ &\leq |I|^{-1} \left(\int_I \left\|\langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} W(x)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\|^2 dx\right) \left(\int_I \left\|W(x)^{\frac{1}{2}} f(x)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d}^2 dx\right) \\ &= \left(|I|^{-1} \int_I \left\|\langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} W(x) \langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\| dx\right) \|f\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^2(W)}^2 \\ &\leq C(d) \|f\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^2(W)}^2 \left\||I|^{-1} \int_I \langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} W(x) \langle W\rangle_I^{-\frac{1}{2}} dx\right\| \\ &= C(d) \|f\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^2(W)}^2,\end{aligned}$$

which gives the needed inequality. □

5.3. **Proofs of Theorems 4.2 and 4.3.** We first prove Theorem 4.2:

Proof. We prove T_W extends to a bounded operator from $L^2(W)$ to $L^2(V)$ using duality. Specifically we show

$$\left|\langle T_W f, g\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \leq C\|f\|_{L^2(W)}\|g\|_{L^2(V)}, \tag{11}$$

for a fixed constant C and all f and g in dense sets of $L^2(W)$ and $L^2(V)$ respectively. Without loss of generality, we can assume f and g are compactly supported and so, we can choose disjoint $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\operatorname{supp}(f), \operatorname{supp}(g) \subseteq I_1 \cup I_2$ and $|I_1| = |I_2| = 2^m$, for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Using (6), we can write

$$f = f_1 + f_2 = \sum_{\substack{I:|I|\leq 2^m \\ 1\leq i\leq d}} \left\langle f, h_I^{W,i}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} h_I^{W,i} + \sum_{k=1}^{2} E_{I_k}^W f \tag{12}$$

$$g = g_1 + g_2 = \sum_{\substack{J:|J|\leq 2^m \\ 1\leq j\leq d}} \left\langle g, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} h_J^{V,j} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{2} E_{I_\ell}^V g. \tag{13}$$

Using these decompositions, it suffices to show

$$\left|\langle T_W f_i, g_j\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \leq C\|f\|_{L^2(W)}\|g\|_{L^2(V)} \qquad \forall 1 \leq i, j \leq 2.$$

First, consider f_1 and g_1. Using Lemma 5.1, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle T_W f_1, g_1\rangle_{L^2(V)} &= \sum_{\substack{I:|I|\leq 2^m \\ 1\leq i\leq d}} \sum_{\substack{J:|J|\leq 2^m \\ 1\leq j\leq d}} \left\langle f, h_I^{W,i}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} \left\langle g, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \\
&= \sum_{\substack{I:|I|\leq 2^m \\ 1\leq i\leq d}} \sum_{\substack{J:|J|\leq 2^m \\ |J|<2^{-r}|I| \\ 1\leq j\leq d}} \left\langle f, h_I^{W,i}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} \left\langle g, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{J:|J|\leq 2^m \\ 1\leq j\leq d}} \sum_{\substack{I:|I|\leq 2^m \\ |I|<2^{-r}|J| \\ 1\leq i\leq d}} \left\langle f, h_I^{W,i}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} \left\langle g, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{I:|I|\leq 2^m \\ 1\leq i\leq d}} \sum_{\substack{J:|J|\leq 2^m \\ 2^{-r}|I|\leq|J|\leq 2^r|I| \\ 1\leq j\leq d}} \left\langle f, h_I^{W,i}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} \left\langle g, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \\
&= \left\langle \Pi^W f_1, g_1\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} + \left\langle f_1, \Pi^V g_1\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{I:|I|\leq 2^m \\ 1\leq i\leq d}} \sum_{\substack{J:|J|\leq 2^m \\ 2^{-r}|I|\leq|J|\leq 2^r|I| \\ 1\leq j\leq d}} \left\langle f, h_I^{W,i}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} \left\langle g, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.2 implies that

$$\left|\left\langle \Pi^W f_1, g_1\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| + \left|\left\langle f_1, \Pi^V g_1\right\rangle_{L^2(W)}\right| \leq \left(A_1 B(W) + A_2 B(V)\right)\|f\|_{L^2(W)}\|g\|_{L^2(V)}.$$

So, we just need to bound the last sum. We first apply Cauchy-Schwarz and exploit symmetry in the sums to obtain:

$$\sum_{\substack{I:|I|\leq 2^m\\ 1\leq i\leq d}}\sum_{\substack{J:|J|\leq 2^m\\ 2^{-r}|I|\leq|J|\leq 2^r|I|\\ 1\leq j\leq d}}\left|\left\langle f,h_I^{W,i}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)}\left\langle g,h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i},h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right|$$

$$\leq\left(\sum_{\substack{I:|I|\leq 2^m\\ 1\leq i\leq d}}\sum_{\substack{J:|J|\leq 2^m\\ 2^{-r}|I|\leq|J|\leq 2^r|I|\\ 1\leq j\leq d}}\left|\left\langle f,h_I^{W,i}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)}\right|^2\left|\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i},h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right|\right)^{1/2} \tag{14}$$

$$\times\left(\sum_{\substack{J:|J|\leq 2^m\\ 1\leq j\leq d}}\sum_{\substack{I:|I|\leq 2^m\\ 2^{-r}|J|\leq|I|\leq 2^r|J|\\ 1\leq i\leq d}}\left|\left\langle g,h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right|^2\left|\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i},h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right|\right)^{1/2}.$$

Now, fix $I\in\mathcal{D}$. Since T_W is well-localized, it is not hard to show that there are only finitely many J satisfying $2^{-r}|I|\leq|J|\leq 2^r|I|$ such that

$$\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i},h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\neq 0.$$

Specifically, the number of such J will always be bounded by a fixed constant times 2^{2r}. Similarly, if we fix J, there are only finitely many I satisfying $2^{-r}|J|\leq|I|\leq 2^r|J|$ such that

$$\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i},h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)}=\left\langle h_I^{W,i},T_V^* h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\neq 0.$$

The number of such I will also be bounded by a fixed constant times 2^{2r}. Thus, we can use the testing conditions and Lemma 5.3 to estimate

$$(14)\leq A_1 2^{2r}C(d)\|f\|_{L^2(W)}\|g\|_{L^2(V)}.$$

The other terms are much simpler. First observe that for each k,ℓ:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left\langle T_W E_{I_k}^W f,E_{I_\ell}^V g\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right|&\leq\left\|T_W E_{I_k}^W f\right\|_{L^2(V)}\left\|\langle V\rangle_{I_\ell}^{-1}\langle Vg\rangle_{I_\ell}\mathbf{1}_{I_\ell}\right\|_{L^2(V)}\\&\leq A_1\left\|W(I_k)^{\frac12}\langle W\rangle_{I_k}^{-1}\langle Wf\rangle_{I_k}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d}\left\|V(I_\ell)^{\frac12}\langle V\rangle_{I_\ell}^{-1}\langle Vg\rangle_{I_\ell}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d}\\&=A_1|I_k|^{\frac12}\left\|\langle W\rangle_{I_k}^{-\frac12}\langle Wf\rangle_{I_k}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d}|I_\ell|^{\frac12}\left\|\langle V\rangle_{I_\ell}^{-\frac12}\langle Vg\rangle_{I_\ell}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d}\\&\leq A_1C(d)\|f\|_{L^2(W)}\|g\|_{L^2(V)},\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 5.4. This immediately implies the desired bound for $\langle T_W f_2,g_2\rangle_{L^2(V)}$. The mixed terms are similarly straightforward. Specifically, observe that

$$\left|\langle T_W f_2,g_1\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right|\leq\|g_1\|_{L^2(V)}\sum_{k=1}^{2}\left\|T_W E_{I_k}^W f\right\|_{L^2(V)}\leq A_1C(d)\|f\|_{L^2(W)}\|g\|_{L^2(V)},$$

using the arguments that appeared in the previous bound. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\langle T_W f_1, g_2\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| = \left|\langle f_1, T_V^* g_2\rangle_{L^2(W)}\right| &\leq \|f_1\|_{L^2(W)} \sum_{\ell=1}^{2} \left\|T_V^* E_{I_\ell}^V g\right\|_{L^2(W)} \\ &\leq A_2 C(d) \|f\|_{L^2(W)} \|g\|_{L^2(V)},\end{aligned}$$

using Lemma 5.4 and the testing condition on T_V^*. This completes the proof. □

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 4.3.

Proof. This theorem is established in basically the same manner as Theorem 4.2. We simply need to check that the weaker conditions (i) and (ii) in Theorem 4.3 allow us to deduce the same estimates. As before, we establish boundedness by duality as in (11), fix f, g compactly supported in $I_1 \cup I_2$ with $|I_1| = |I_2| = 2^m$, and decompose

$$f = f_1 + f_2 \quad \text{and } g = g_1 + g_2$$

as in (12) and (13). As before,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle T_W f_1, g_1\rangle_{L^2(V)} &= \left\langle \Pi^W f_1, g_1\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} + \left\langle f_1, \Pi^V g_1\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{I:|I|\leq 2^m \\ 1\leq i\leq d}} \sum_{\substack{J:|J|\leq 2^m \\ 2^{-r}|I|\leq|J|\leq 2^r|I| \\ 1\leq j\leq d}} \left\langle f, h_I^{W,i}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)} \left\langle g, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}.\end{aligned}$$

The first two terms can be controlled by testing hypothesis (i) and Lemma 5.2. For the sum, we can use Lemma 5.3 and testing hypothesis (ii) to conclude

$$\left|\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \leq C(d) A_3.$$

Since T_W is still well-localized with radius r, we can use the strategy from the proof of Theorem 4.2 to immediately conclude:

$$\left|\langle T_W f_1, g_1\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \leq 2^{2r} C(d) \left(A_1 B(W) + A_2 B(V) + A_3\right) \|f\|_{L^2(W)} \|g\|_{L^2(V)}.$$

The other terms are also straightforward. First observe that since $|I_k| = |I_\ell|$, assumption (ii) paired with Lemma 5.4 implies that for each k, ℓ:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left\langle T_W E_{I_k}^W f, E_{I_\ell}^V g\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| &\leq A_3 \left\|W(I_k)^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle W\rangle_{I_k}^{-1} \langle Wf\rangle_{I_k}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \left\|V(I_\ell)^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle V\rangle_{I_\ell}^{-1} \langle Vg\rangle_{I_\ell}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\ &= A_3 |I_k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\|\langle W\rangle_{I_k}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle Wf\rangle_{I_k}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} |I_\ell|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\|\langle V\rangle_{I_\ell}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle Vg\rangle_{I_\ell}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\ &\leq A_3 C(d) \|f\|_{L^2(W)} \|g\|_{L^2(V)}. \qquad (15)\end{aligned}$$

This immediately gives the desired bound for $\langle T_W f_2, g_2\rangle_{L^2(V)}$. The mixed terms require a bit more work. We consider $\langle T_W f_2, g_1\rangle_{L^2(V)}$. The other term can be handled analogously.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\langle T_W f_2, g_1\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{2} \sum_{\substack{J:|J|\leq 2^m \\ 1\leq j\leq d}} \left|\left\langle g, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \left\langle T_W E_{I_k}^W f, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{2} \sum_{\substack{J:J\subseteq I_k \\ 1\leq j\leq d}} \left|\left\langle g, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \left\langle T_W E_{I_k}^W f, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \qquad (16) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{2} \sum_{\substack{J:|J|\leq 2^m, J\not\subset I_k \\ 1\leq j\leq d}} \left|\left\langle g, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \left\langle T_W E_{I_k}^W f, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right|. \qquad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

We have to handle (16) and (17) separately. To handle (16), simply use Cauchy-Schwarz, Lemma 5.4, and assumption (i) to conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{2} \sum_{\substack{J:J\subseteq I_k \\ 1\leq j\leq d}} \left|\left\langle g, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \left\langle T_W E_{I_k}^W f, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{2} \left\|\mathbf{1}_{I_k} T_W E_{I_k}^W f\right\|_{L^2(V)} \left\|\mathbf{1}_{I_k} g\right\|_{L^2(V)} \\
&\leq A_1 \|g\|_{L^2(V)} \sum_{k=1}^{2} |I_k|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\|\langle W\rangle_{I_k}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle W f\rangle_{I_k}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\
&\leq A_1 C(d) \|f\|_{L^2(W)} \|g\|_{L^2(V)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, consider (17). Since T_W is well-localized with radius r, one can easily that show that for each I_k, there are at most a fixed constant times 2^{2r} intervals J that satisfy

$$\left\langle T_W E_{I_k}^W f, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \neq 0,$$

$|J| \leq 2^m$, and $J \not\subset I_k$. Indeed, for the inner product to be nonzero, J must satisfy $J \subset I_k^{(r+1)}$ and $|J| > 2^{-r}|I_k|$. Now, using assumption (ii), Lemma 5.4, and Lemma 2.4, we can establish

the following sequence:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(17) &= \sum_{k=1}^{2} \sum_{\substack{J:2^{-r}|I_k|<|J|\le|I_k| \\ J\subset I_k^{(r+1)} J\not\subset I_k \\ 1\le j\le d}} \left|\left\langle g, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)} \left\langle T_W E_{I_k}^W f, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \\
&\le \|g\|_{L^2(V)} \sum_{k=1}^{2} \sum_{\substack{J:2^{-r}|I_k|\le|J|\le|I_k| \\ J\subset I_k^{(r+1)},\, J\not\subset I_k \\ 1\le j\le d}} \left|\left\langle T_W E_{I_k}^W f, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \\
&\le A_3\|g\|_{L^2(V)} \sum_{k=1}^{2} \sum_{\substack{J:2^{-r}|I_k|<|J|\le|I_k| \\ J\subset I_k^{(r+1)},\, J\not\subset I_k \\ 1\le j\le d}} |I_k|^{\frac12} \left\|\langle W\rangle_{I_k}^{-\frac12} \langle Wf\rangle_{I_k}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \left\|V(I_-)^{\frac12} h_J^{V,j}(J_-)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\
&\quad + A_3\|g\|_{L^2(V)} \sum_{k=1}^{2} \sum_{\substack{J:2^{-r}|I_k|\le|J|\le|I_k| \\ J\subset I_k^{(r+1)},\, J\not\subset I_k \\ 1\le j\le d}} |I_k|^{\frac12} \left\|\langle W\rangle_{I_k}^{-\frac12} \langle Wf\rangle_{I_k}\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \left\|V(J_+)^{\frac12} h_J^{V,j}(J_+)\right\|_{\mathbb{C}^d} \\
&\le 2^{2r} C(d) A_3 \|g\|_{L^2(V)} \|f\|_{L^2(W)},
\end{aligned}
$$

which completes the proof. □

Remark 5.5. As mentioned earlier, our definition of well-localized is slightly different than the one appearing in [11], where Nazarov-Treil-Volberg only impose conditions on T_W when $|J| \le |I|$, rather than $|J| \le 2|I|$. The difference is likely attributable to a typographical error and their ideas are essentially correct.

However, to see why imposing conditions on only $|J| \le |I|$ is not quite sufficient, let us consider the role of the well-localized property in the proofs of Theorems 4.2 and 4.3. It is used to show that for each fixed I, there is at most a finite number of J with $2^{-r}|I| \le |J| \le 2^r|I|$ such that

$$\left|\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \neq 0.$$

This allows one to control related sums given in (14). However, the definition of well-localized given by Nazarov-Treil-Volberg is not quite enough for this, as it does not handle the case where $|I| = |J|$. In this case, one would need control over terms such as

$$\left|\left\langle T_W h_I^{W,i}(I_+)\mathbf{1}_{I_+}, h_J^{V,j}\right\rangle_{L^2(V)}\right| \text{ or } \left|\left\langle h_I^{W,i}, T_V^* h_J^{V,j}(J_+)\mathbf{1}_{J_+}\right\rangle_{L^2(W)}\right|,$$

which are not addressed in their definition of well-localized since $|I_+| < |J|$ and $|J_+| < |I|$. This case is no longer a problem if we impose conditions on all I, J with $|J| \le 2|I|$ as in Definition 4.1. For an example of what can go wrong, fix $K_0 \in \mathcal{D}$. Fix a sequence $\{c_K\}$ in $\ell^2(\mathcal{D})$ with no nonzero terms, and define the operator $T : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \to L^2(\mathbb{R})$ by

$$Th_{K_0} \equiv \sum_{K:|K|=|K_0|} c_K h_K \quad \text{and} \quad Th_L \equiv 0 \text{ for } L \neq K_0.$$

It is not difficult to show T is well-localized (with radius 0) from $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ according to the definition in [11]. Indeed, if $|J| \leq |I|$, then

$$\langle T\mathbf{1}_I, h_J\rangle_{L^2} = 0 = \langle T^*\mathbf{1}_I, h_J\rangle_{L^2}\,.$$

To see these equalities, first write

$$\mathbf{1}_I = \sum_{K:I\subsetneq K} \langle \mathbf{1}_I, h_K\rangle_{L^2}\, h_K.$$

Thus, if I is not strictly contained in K_0, then $T\mathbf{1}_I = 0$. So, we can assume $I \subsetneq K_0$. Then $|J| \leq |I| < |K_0|$ so

$$\langle T\mathbf{1}_I, h_J\rangle_{L^2} = \sum_{K:|K|=|K_0|} \langle \mathbf{1}_I, h_{K_0}\rangle_{L^2}\, c_K\, \langle h_K, h_J\rangle_{L^2} = 0.$$

Now consider T^*. If $|J| \leq |I|$ and $J \neq K_0$, then

$$\langle T^*\mathbf{1}_I, h_J\rangle_{L^2} = \langle \mathbf{1}_I, Th_J\rangle_{L^2} = \langle \mathbf{1}_I, 0\rangle_{L^2} = 0$$

immediately. If $J = K_0$, then

$$\langle T^*\mathbf{1}_I, h_J\rangle_{L^2} = \sum_{K:K=|K_0|} \overline{c_K}\, \langle \mathbf{1}_I, h_K\rangle_{L^2} = 0,$$

since $|K_0| = |J| \leq |I|$ implies $K \subseteq I$ or $K \cap I = 0$. However, for this operator T,

$$\langle Th_{K_0}, h_J\rangle_{L^2} = c_J \neq 0,$$

for all J with $|J| = |K_0|$. Since there are is infinite number of such J, this means we could not use the well-localized property to control the sums from (14) for this operator.

Remark 5.6. In this paper, we only considered band operators defined on $L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}^d)$. However, we anticipate that these T1 theorems will generalize without substantial difficulty to band operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{C}^d)$. One must define a slightly more complicated Haar system, but in general, the tools and proof strategy seem to work without issue.

References

[1] K. Bickel, S. Petermichl, and B.D. Wick. Bounds for the Hilbert Transform with Matrix A_2 Weights. *preprint*, available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.3886. 2

[2] M. Christ and M. Goldberg. Vector A_2 weights and a Hardy-Littlewood maximal function. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **353** (2001), no. 5, 1995–2002. 2

[3] M. Goldberg. Matrix A_p weights via maximal functions. *Pacific J. Math.* **211** (2003), no. 2, 201–220. 2

[4] P.T. Hytönen. The sharp weighted bound for general Calderón-Zygmund operators. *Ann. of Math. (2).* **175** (2012), no. 3, 1473–1506. 2

[5] J. Isralowitz, H. Kwon, and S. Pott. A Matrix Weighted $T1$ Theorem for Matrix Kerneled Calderón–Zygmund Operators - I *preprint*, available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1401.6570. 2, 5, 10, 12, 13, 14

[6] R. Kerr. Toeplitz products and two-weight inequalities on spaces of vector-valued functions. Thesis (Ph.D.)-University of Glasgow. 2011. 4

[7] R. Kerr. Martingale transforms, the dyadic shift and the Hilbert transform: a sufficient condition for boundedness between matrix weighted spaces. *preprint*, available at http://arxiv.org/abs/0906.4028. 4

[8] M. Lacey, S. Petermichl, and M.C. Reguera. Sharp A_2 inequality for Haar shift operators. *Math. Ann.* **348** (2010), no. 1, 127–141. 1

[9] M. Lauzon and S.Treil. Scalar and vector Muckenhoupt weights. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **56** (2007), no. 4, 1989–2015. 2

[10] F. Nazarov, G. Pisier, S. Treil, and A. Volberg. Sharp estimates in vector Carleson imbedding theorem and for vector paraproducts. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **542** (2002), 147–171. 2

[11] F. Nazarov, S. Treil, and A. Volberg. Two weight inequalities for individual Haar multipliers and other well-localized operators. *Math. Res. Lett.* **15** (2008), no. 3, 583–597. 2, 3, 4, 5, 14, 25, 26

[12] F. Nazarov and S. Treil. The hunt for a Bellman function: applications to estimates for singular integral operators and to other classical problems of harmonic analysis. (Russian) *Algebra i Analiz.* **8** (1996), no. 5, 32–162; translation in *St. Petersburg Math. J.* **8** (1997), no. 5, 721–824. 2

[13] N.K. Nikolskiĭ. *Treatise on the Shift Operator.* Translated from the Russian by Jaak Peetre. *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften* (Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences), **273**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986. 10

[14] S. Treil and A. Volberg. Wavelets and the angle between past and future. *J. Funct. Anal.* **143** (1997), no. 2, 269–308. 2, 5, 9, 10, 12

[15] A. Volberg. Matrix A_p weights via S-functions. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **10** (1997), no. 2, 445–466. 2, 14

Kelly Bickel, Department of Mathematics, Bucknell University, 701 Moore Ave, Lewisburg, PA 17837

E-mail address: kelly.bickel@bucknell.edu

Brett D. Wick, School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, 686 Cherry Street, Atlanta, GA USA 30332-0160

E-mail address: wick@math.gatech.edu

URL: www.math.gatech.edu/~wick